

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/486,483	03/23/2001	Kunio Sekiya	24555-001	6972
26691 7 POTTER ANDE	EXAM	EXAMINER		
ATTN: KATHL	EEN W. GEIGER, ES		HALPERN, MARK	
P.O. BOX 951 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0951			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1731	<u> </u>
				•
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MON	THS	02/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/486,483	SEKIYA, KUNIO			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mark Halpern	1731			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addres	ss		
Period fo						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the may ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commu	·		
Status	<u> </u>	•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06	February 2007.				
-	,	his action is non-final.				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merit					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dienositi	ion of Claims	•				
·		· ·				
-	Claim(s) 2 and 7 is/are pending in the applic					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	irawn from consideration.				
· · ·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
-	Claim(s) 2, 7 is/are rejected.	\$ *				
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers	\$* 2				
·· _	•	iner				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	- A		121(d)		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the					
٠٠/	The sain of declaration is objected to by the	Examinor: Note the discont	,a Childo / lolloli or lollili i i c			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	<u> </u>				
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have beën received in a	Application No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have been	n received in this National Sta	ge		
	application from the International Bur	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action, for a l	ist of the certified copies no	t received.			
	•	;				
		•				
	'	:				
Attachmen						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		Informal Patent Application			
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	·			

Art Unit: 1731

DETAILED ACTION

1) Acknowledgement is made of Response received 2/6/2007.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2) Claim 2 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7-9 of copending Application No. 10/501,303. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the present application and the patent disclose a method for preventing contamination of a surface of a canvas pressing a surface of a

Application/Control Number: 09/486,483

Art Unit: 1731

dryer drum used in a papermaking machine that includes the treatment of the rotating drum surface while facing a paper strip with a silicone oil.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3) Claim 7 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 10/540,617. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the present application and the patent disclose a method for preventing contamination of a surface of a canvas used in a papermaking machine that includes the treatment of an out-roll with a silicone oil.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Amendment

The terminal disclaimers filed on 2/6/2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of patents U.S. 6,858,113, and U.S. 7,144,478, have been reviewed and are accepted.

The terminal disclaimers have been recorded.

Conclusion

5) THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1731

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 571-272-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MARK HALPERN
PRIMARY EXAMINER